

Remarks

The Office Action dated September 9, 2003 has been carefully reviewed and the foregoing amendment has been made in consequence thereof.

Claims 1-76, 86-102, and 106-120 are pending in this application. Claims 1-85 and 103-105 stand rejected. Claims 77-85 and 103-105 have been cancelled. Claims 86-102 and 106-120 are withdrawn from consideration.

In accordance with 37 C.F.R. 1.136(a), a one two extension of time is submitted herewith to extend the due date of the response to the Office Action dated September 9, 2003, for the above-identified patent application from December 9, 2003, through and including February 9, 2004. In accordance with 37 C.F.R. 1.17(a), authorization to charge a deposit account in the amount of \$420.00 to cover this extension of time request also is submitted herewith.

Submitted herewith, for approval, are 16 sheets of formal drawings that correct the informalities indicated in the Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review.

The rejection of Claims 1-21, 23-35, 37-64, 66-72, 74-85, and 103-105 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Spriggs et al. (US 6,421,571) is respectfully traversed.

Spriggs et al. describe a system that includes a data acquisition module, a database module, a display module including a graphical user interface, and a utilities module. The data acquisition module includes a software module and a plurality of data collector modules to interface with data acquisition devices. The database module includes a relational database for storing the collected data and configuration information. The utilities module includes software modules that increase the communications abilities of the system.

Claim 1 of the present application recites a method for managing internal components of nuclear reactor plants using a network-based system. The method includes the steps of developing inspection recommendations for specific internal components based on information received and information stored in the database, and determining cracking susceptibility for specific internal components based on information received and information stored in the database.

Spriggs et al. do not describe nor suggest a method for managing internal components of nuclear reactor plants as recited in Claim 1. Particularly, Spriggs et al. do not describe nor suggest a method that includes the steps of developing inspection recommendations for specific internal components based on information received and information stored in the database, and determining cracking susceptibility for specific internal components based on information received and information stored in the database. Rather, Spriggs et al. describe collecting data from a plurality of data acquisition devices and generating alarms when the collected data is outside a predetermined allowable range. Spriggs et al. do not describe nor suggest developing inspection recommendations from the collected data, and do not describe nor suggest determining cracking susceptibility of specific internal nuclear reactor plant components based on the collected data. Accordingly, Applicants submit that Claim 1 is patentable over Spriggs et al.

Claims 2-21 and 23-32 depend from independent Claim 1. When the recitations of dependent Claims 2-21 and 23-32 are considered in combination with the recitations of Claim 1, Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 2-21 and 23-32 likewise are patentable over Spriggs et al.

Claim 33 recites a network-based system for managing assets that includes a server system configured to develop inspection recommendations for specific internal components based on information received and information stored in the database, and determine cracking susceptibility for specific internal components based on information received and information stored in the database.

Spriggs et al. do not describe nor suggest a network-based system for managing assets as recited in Claim 33. Particularly, Spriggs et al. do not describe nor suggest a server system configured to develop inspection recommendations for specific internal components based on information received and information stored in the database, and determine cracking susceptibility for specific internal components based on information received and information stored in the database. Rather, Spriggs et al. describe collecting data from a plurality of data acquisition devices and generating alarms when the collected data is outside a predetermined allowable range. Spriggs et al. do not describe nor suggest developing inspection recommendations from the collected data, and do not describe nor suggest determining cracking susceptibility of specific internal nuclear reactor plant components based on the collected data. Accordingly, Applicants submit that Claim 33 is patentable over Spriggs et al.

Claims 34-35 and 37-64, 66-72, and 74-76 depend from independent Claim 33. When the recitations of dependent Claims 34-35 and 37-64, 66-72, and 74-76 are considered in combination with the recitations of Claim 33, Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 34-35 and 37-64, 66-72, and 74-76 likewise are patentable over Spriggs et al.

Claims 77-85 and 103-105 have been canceled

For the reasons set forth above, Applicants respectfully request that the Section 102(e) rejection of Claims 1-21, 23-35, 37-64, 66-72, 74-85, and 103-105 be withdrawn.

The rejection of Claims 22, 36, 65, and 73 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Spriggs et al. (US 6,421,571) in view of Bodo et al. (US 6,122,239) is respectfully traversed.

At least for the reasons explained above, Claims 1 and 33 are submitted to be patentable over Spriggs et al.

Bodo et al. is cited for teaching a method and system where the sending component functions in response to a voice command. Bodo et al. is not cited for, and does not teach a method that includes the steps of developing inspection recommendations for specific internal components based on information received and information stored in the database, and determining cracking susceptibility for specific internal components based on information received and information stored in the database. Also, Bodo et al. is not cited for, and does not teach a server system configured to develop inspection recommendations for specific internal components based on information received and information stored in the database, and determine cracking susceptibility for specific internal components based on information received and information stored in the database. As explained above, Spriggs et al. do not describe nor suggest such a method or such a system.

Spriggs et al. and Bodo et al., alone or in combination, do not describe nor suggest a method for managing internal components of nuclear reactor plants as recited in Claim 1 or a network-based system for managing assets as recited in Claim 33. Particularly, and as explained above, Spriggs et al. and Bodo et al., alone or in combination, do not describe nor suggest a

method that includes the steps of developing inspection recommendations for specific internal components based on information received and information stored in the database, and determining cracking susceptibility for specific internal components based on information received and information stored in the database. Further, Spriggs et al. and Bodo et al., alone or in combination, do not describe nor suggest a server system configured to develop inspection recommendations for specific internal components based on information received and information stored in the database, and determine cracking susceptibility for specific internal components based on information received and information stored in the database. Accordingly, Applicants submit that independent Claims 1 and 33 are patentable over Spriggs et al. and Bodo et al., alone or in combination.

Claim 22 depends from independent Claim 1 and Claims 36, 65, and 73 depend from independent Claim 33. When the recitations of dependent Claims 22 and 36, 65, and 73 are considered in combination with the recitations of Claims 1 and 33 respectively, Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 22, 36, 65, and 73 likewise are patentable over Spriggs et al. and Bodo et al., alone or in combination.

For the reasons set forth above, Applicants respectfully request that the Section 103(a) rejection of Claims 22, 36, 65, and 73 be withdrawn.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, all the claims now active in this application are believed to be in condition for allowance. Favorable action is respectfully

solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, reading "Michael Tersillo". The signature is fluid and cursive, with the first name "Michael" and last name "Tersillo" clearly distinguishable.

Michael Tersillo
Registration No. 42,180
ARMSTRONG TEASDALE LLP
One Metropolitan Square, Suite 2600
St. Louis, Missouri 63102-2740
(314) 621-5070